

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 29 and 30 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention.

The amendments here presented are made for the purposes of better defining the invention, rather than to overcome the rejections for patentability. Support for the amendments herein presented can be found in the specification and claims as filed. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendments. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

### Record of Interview

On July 15, 2003, an interview was conducted by telephone between the Examiner and Andrew Gathy, Reg. No. 46,441. The Examiner is thanked for granting this interview.

The Advisory Action of July 7, 2003 was discussed, particularly the suggestion to include more specific language regarding the diamond being directly deposited on a non-metallic framework. The Examiner asserted that the addition of the word “directly” before the word “deposited” would place the case into a condition for allowance. The representative for applicant agreed to the amendment and indicated that a Supplemental Response to Final would be forthcoming. The Examiner was thanked for the suggestion.

### The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Jury et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,918,220). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Advisory Action, the Advisory Action asserts that Jury still reads on the claimed subject matter.

The claims 1, 6, 29 and 30 have been amended to include allowable subject matter per the above telephone interview. Thus the rejection is now moot.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn and it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Jury et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,918,220). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Advisory Action, the Advisory Action asserts that Jury still reads on the claimed subject matter.

The claims 1, 6, 29 and 30 have been amended to include allowable subject matter per the above telephone interview. Thus the rejection is now moot.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn and it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Jury et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,918,220) as applied to claim 6 above, further in view of Kasprzyk et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,559,244). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Advisory Action, the Advisory Action asserts that Jury in view of Kasprzyk is still obvious to the claimed subject matter.

The claims 1, 6, 29 and 30 have been amended to include allowable subject matter per the above telephone interview. Thus the rejection is now moot.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn and it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

The argument and evidence set forth above is equally applicable here. Since the independent Claims 1 and 6 are allowable, then the dependent Claims 2-4 and 7-9 and 11 must also be allowable. If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn and it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.


Request for Allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below. Entry of this Amendment places the Application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment is appropriate and is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

Dated: *July 22 2001*

  
Andrew D. Gathy  
Reg. No.: 46,441

Sierra Patent Group  
P.O. Box 6149  
Stateline, NV 89449  
(775) 586-9500